## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT APR 21 AM 1: 15

Trenton Harris.

Civil Action No.:

DEPUTY CLERK\_

Plaintiff.

٧.

8-17CV1067-G

CNU of Texas, LLC Defendant.

COMPLAINT

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Trenton Harris, states as follows:

#### **JURISDICTION**

- 1. This action arises out of Defendant's repeated violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. 227 §, et seq. (the "TCPA") by negligently, knowingly, and/or willfully placing automated calls to Plaintiff's cellular phone without consent, thereby violating the TCPA, and the invasions of the Plaintiff's personal privacy.
- 2. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) & (c), because Plaintiff resides within the Northern District of Texas, a substantial

portion of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this District, and Defendant regularly transacts business in this District.

#### **PARTIES**

- 3. The Plaintiff, TRENTON HARRIS ("Plaintiff" or "Mr. Harris"), is an adult individual residing in Dallas, Texas, and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).
- 4. Defendant CNU OF TEXAS, LLC ("Defendant" or "CASHNET", is doing business in the State of Texas.
- 5. Defendant is and at all times mentioned herein was, a corporation and is a "person," as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).
- 6. CASHNET at all times acted by and through one or more collectors.

### **FACTS**

- 7. Beginning in and around February, 2017, CASHNET placed calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone, number 858-335-9276.
- 8. At all times mentioned herein, CASHNET called Plaintiff using an automated telephone dialer system ("ATDS" or "predictive dialer") and/or by using an artificial or prerecorded voice.
- 9. On February 14, 2017, in a three minute phone call that began at 2:21 p.m., Plaintiff called the Defendant and spoke with a CASHNET

representative (the "February 14, 2017 Call"). During this call the Plaintiff advised CASHNET to cease all further communications and revoked consent to call him on his cell phone.

- 10. Furthermore, on February 21, 2017, a letter was sent by certified mail return receipt requested (the "February 21, 2017 letter"). This letter was received by the Defendant and signed for on February 24, 2017. In this letter the Plaintiff again advised CASHNET to cease all communications and stop all further calls to his cell phone.
- 11. Plaintiff continued receiving daily automated phone calls on his cell phone from CASHNET despite his requests to cease all communications.
- 12. In specific, the Plaintiff documented the following illegal communications from CASHNET:
- a. On February 15, 2017, at 2:33pm Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from 1-866-653-2116. Plaintiff did not answer the phone. Plaintiff looked up the phone number and found it to be the Defendant's phone number. Defendant hung up and did not leave a message.
- b. On February 16, 2017, at 9:05am Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- c. On February 17, 2017, at 9:28am Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.

- d. On February 23, 2017, at 9:03am Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- e. On February 24, 2017, at 1:31pm Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- f. On February 28, 2017, at 1:12pm Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- g. On March 1, 2017, at 12:46pm Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- h. On March 2, 2017, at 12:34pm Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- i. On March 3, 2017, at 1:22pm Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- j. On March 7, 2017, at 10:41am Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- k. On March 8, 2017, at 10:27am Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- I. On March 9, 2017, at 10:30am Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- m. On March 10, 2017, at 11:50am Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.

- n. On March 13, 2017, at 11:51am Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- o. On March 14, 2017, at 11:59am Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- p. On March 15, 2017, at 12:08pm Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- q. On March 16, 2017, at 12:20pm Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- r. On March 17, 2017, at 11:43am Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- s. On March 20, 2017, at 10:23am Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- t. On March 21, 2017, at 10:45am Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- u. On March 22, 2017, at 12:37pm Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- v. On March 23, 2017, at 3:01pm Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- w. On March 24, 2017, at 11:54am Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.

- x. On March 27, 2017, at 3:14pm Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- y. On March 28, 2017, at 2:51pm Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- z. On March 29, 2017, at 2:30pm Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number. A woman calling herself "Jasmine" from "CNU" left a at 28 second pre-recorded voicemail message stating there was a "time sensitive issue to discuss" and provided a phone number to call, which was 1-888-801-9078, a phone number belonging to Defendant.
- aa. On March 30, 2017, at 4:05pm Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- bb. On April 3, 2017, at 4:17pm Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- cc. On April 5, 2017, at 5:53pm Plaintiff received a phone call on his cell phone from Defendant's phone number.
- 13. Plaintiff was contacted nearly every day after the Defendant was placed on notice that he revoked permission to contact him on his cell phone.

### THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION

#### **ACT OF 1991**

- 14. In 1991, Congress enacted the TCPA in response to a growing number of consumer complaints regarding telemarketing practices.
- 15. The TCPA regulates the use of automated telephone dialing systems.
- 16. 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1) defines an automatic telephone dialing system ("ATDS") as equipment having the capacity –
- (A) to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using random or sequential number generator; and
  - (B) to dial such numbers.
- 17. Specifically, 47 U.S.C. § 227(1)(A)(iii) prohibits any call using an ATDS or an artificial or prerecorded voice to a cellular phone without prior express consent by the person being called, unless the call is for an emergency.
- 18. According to the Federal Communications Commission, such calls are prohibited because automated or prerecorded telephone calls are a greater nuisance and invasion of privacy than live solicitation calls. The

FCC also recognized that wireless customers are charged for incoming calls.<sup>1</sup>

- 19. On January 4, 2008, the FCC released a Declaratory Ruling where it confirmed that autodialed and prerecorded calls to a wireless number by a creditor, or on behalf of a creditor, are permitted only if the calls are made with the "prior express consent" of the called party.<sup>2</sup>
- 20. On July 10, 2015, the FCC issued FCC Order 15-72 where the FCC<sup>3</sup> stated that "a caller may not limit the manner in which revocation of prior express consent to call may occur" and that the "burden is on the caller to prove it obtained the necessary prior express consent". *Id.* at ¶ 30.
- 21. Further, consumers (the Plaintiff) may revoke consent through any reasonable means. *Id.* at ¶ 47.
- 22. Nothing in the language of the TCPA of its legislative history supports the notion that Congress intended to override a consumer's common law right to revoke consent. *Id.* at ¶ 58.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, CG Docket No. 02-278, Report and Order, 18 FCC Red 14014 (2003).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, 23 F.C.C.R. 559, 23 FCC Red 559, 43 Communications Reg. (P&F) 877, 2008 WL 65485 (F.C.C.) (2008).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Declaratory Ruling and Order, Adopted June 18, 2015, and Released July 10, 2015 regarding *In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, CG Docket No. 02-278, WC Docket No. 07-135 (https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs\_public/attachmatch/FCC-15-72A1.pdf).

- 23. Some consumers may find unwanted intrusions by phone more offensive than home mailings because they can cost them money and because, for many, their phone is with them at almost all times. *Id.* at ¶ 61.
- 24. Consumers have a right to revoke consent, using any reasonable method including orally or in writing. *Id.* at ¶ 64.

# ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL TCPA COUNTS

- 25. The Plaintiff received numerous calls from the Defendant to his cell phone.
- 26. It is believed that the Defendant employs an automatic telephone dialing system ("ATDS") which meets the definition set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1).
- 27. Defendant or its agent(s) contacted Plaintiff on Plaintiff's cell phone number ending in "9276" via an ATDS as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1), as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
- 28. On February 14, 2017, in a three-minute phone call that began at 2:21pm., Plaintiff called the Defendant and spoke with a CASHNET representative. During this call the Plaintiff instructed Defendant and/or its

- agent(s) not to call the Plaintiff's cell phone again thereby revoking consent, if any ever existed, to be contacted by Defendant via an ATDS.
- 29. On February 21, 2017, Plaintiff mailed a letter certified mail return receipt requested that requested Defendant cease all further communications and stop calling the Plaintiff's cell phone.
- 30. Defendant continued to place calls to the Plaintiff's cellular phone without consent using an ATDS in violation of the TCPA numerous times thereafter.
- 31. Defendant's ATDS has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator.
- 32. The telephone number that Defendant used to contact Plaintiff was and is assigned to a cellular telephone service as specified in 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).
- 33. Defendant's calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone were not for "emergency purposes."
- 34. Pursuant to the TCPA and the FCC's January 2008 Declaratory
  Ruling, the burden is on Defendant to demonstrate that it had prior express
  consent to call Plaintiff's cell phone with an ATDS.

#### **COUNT I**

# VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT – (47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.)

- 35. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the above paragraphs of this Complaint and incorporates them herein by reference.
- 36. Defendant negligently placed multiple automated calls to Plaintiff's cell phone without Plaintiff's prior express consent.
- 37. Each of the aforementioned calls by the Defendant constitutes a negligent violation of the TCPA.
- 38. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of the TCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each call in violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- 39. Plaintiff is entitled to and seeks injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct by Defendant in the future.

### **COUNT II**

Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, (47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.)

- 40. Plaintiff repeats and reallages the above paragraphs of this Complaint and incorporates them herein by reference.
- 41. Defendant knowingly and/or willfully placed multiple automated calls to Plaintiffs cell phone without Plaintiff's prior express consent.
- 42. Each of the aforementioned calls by the Defendant constitutes a knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA.
- 43. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of treble damages up to \$1,500.00 for each call in violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).
- 44. Plaintiff is entitled to seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct by Defendant in the future.

#### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff respectfully prays that judgment be awarded in the Plaintiff's favor and against the Defendants as follows:

- Injunctive relief prohibiting such violations of the TCPA by Defendant in the future.
- 2. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each and every call in violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B);

- 3. Treble damages of up to \$1,500.00 for each and every call in violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C)
- 4. Actual damages from the Defendant for all the damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;
- 5. Punitive damages; and
- 6. Such other and further relief that the court deems appropriate.

Date: April 21, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

Trenton Harris

Phone: (858) 335-9276

Email: trenttharris@yahoo.com

8516 Westfield DR

Dallas, TX 75243 Trestriffaris

#### Case 3:17-cv-01067-G-BK Document 3 Filed 04/21/17

JS 44 (Rev. 08/16) - TXND (Rev. 12/16)

#### **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

Page 14

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

CLERK U.S. DISTRUCT COURT CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT ORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXA

L (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS	TORTHERN	DISTRICT OF TEXA	
Trenton Harris (NY OF Texas, LLC						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (OUNTY OF Dallo) County of Residence of First Listed Defendant						
(EX	(CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	SES)	NOTE: IN LAND CO	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)		
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)			Attorneys (If Known)	Attorneys (If Known) <b>8-17CV1067-G</b>		
			8	-17CVI	001-4	
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in Oi	ne Box Only)	II. CITIZENSHIP OF PI	RINCIPAL PARTIES		
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT Citizen of This State			
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State			
			Citizen or Subject of a  Foreign Country			
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.  CONTRACT  TORIS  FORFEITURE PENALTY  BANKEUPICY  OTHER STATUTES						
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment ← Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans ← (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment ← of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise  ■ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Bjectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY    310 Airplane   315 Airplane Product   Liability   320 Assault, Libel &   Slander   330 Federal Employers'   Liability   340 Marine   345 Marine Product   Liability   350 Motor Vehicle   355 Motor Vehicle   Product Liability   360 Other Personal   Injury   362 Personal Injury   Medical Malpractice   CIVIL RIGHTS   440 Other Civil Rights   441 Voting   442 Employment   443 Housing/   Accommodations   445 Amer. w/Disabilities -   Employment   446 Amer. w/Disabilities -   Other   448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability Personal Injury - Product Liability Personal Injury Product Liability Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERT  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERT  385 Property Damage Product Liability  PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus:  463 Alien Detainee  510 Motions to Vacate Sentence  530 General  535 Death Penalty Other:	of Property 21 USC 881    690 Other	### BANKRUPTCY  ### 422 Appeal 28 USC 158  ### 423 Withdrawal	375 False Claims Act 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
	moved from 3	Conditions of Confinement  Remanded from Appellate Court	Reopened Anothe	erred from	- Litigation -	
	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	tute under which you are	(specify) filing (Po not cite jurisdictional stat		Direct File	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of ca	use:	e Telephone.	Consumer Pro-	tellion AIT	
VIL REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:  UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ QYES ONO						
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY  (See instructions): JUDGE  DOCKET NUMBER						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY  SIGNATURE OF ATTORNHY OF RECORD  SIGNATURE OF ATTORNHY OF RECORD  TO OFFICE USE ONLY						
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	MDGE	MAG. JUI	OGE	